

Harry Clark
130 Old Highway
Wilton, CT 06897

Housing Committee
Legislative Office Building Room 2700
Hartford, CT 06106

2/6/23

With regards to Raised Bill No. 6633,

I cannot begin to conceive of a worse law than 8-30g, but apparently some legislators have. Place me firmly in the "opposition" camp.

An unelected, outside group under the umbrella of a "nonprofit" has come up with a mandate that further erodes the power on residents of the state of Connecticut. Setting arbitrary goals and requirements, forcing current residents to accept a mandate from people "who know better" is decidedly NOT democracy.

I am loathe to engage in hyperbole, but for a moment, let me ask an open ended question: What is "fair"? My answer: Life is not "fair". Jobs, health, and housing can never be "fair" if you move the definition around enough. I would very much like to live in a 5,000 square foot house on 4 acres in the back country of Greenwich; my commute would be shorter, I could spend more time with my family, and we would be marginally safer and happier. But that's fantasy. I don't make enough money to live there. Is that "fair"? No, but I accept that, and I have made my choice. I'm fully aware that my example is meant to be silly, but step back for a minute and ponder: is it any different than a family who currently lives in Danbury but wishes to live in Redding? I'm not sure the framing of "fair" is as clear-cut as this advocacy group has made it out to be.

Additionally, I have observed that in all things, original goals turn out to never quite be "enough". If the municipalities in Connecticut are forced to comply with this arbitrary mandate, a new group will emerge 10 or 20 years hence, with a new "goal". Something along the lines of "That was then. Things change. That was a good start, but..." Control, once gifted, is never given up.

The truth is, all municipalities in Connecticut are working towards affordability, and have incorporated elements of this into their PCODs, as required by law. Some are moving faster than others. Most are trying to design their plan around access to transportation and highways, and minimize the impact on the existing taxpayers of their towns and cities. It's a slow, cumbersome, but FAIR process. Mandates from afar hurt everyone. And I can guarantee you this: were the goals of this bill fulfilled, most of Connecticut would end up so overcrowded, with a declining quality of life, that a steady exodus would begin. Those who have made Connecticut our home do NOT want to see this. Please vote NO.

Sincerely,

Harry Clark